

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the present application.

In summary, the Examiner maintains the previous rejections based on the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, and adds a few supplemental arguments in the current Office Action.

Specifically, claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12, and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oosthoek et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156599) in view of Karagiannis (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087699). Claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oosthoek in view of Karagiannis, and further in view of Trans et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016770). Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oosthoek in view of Bolding et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,272,651). Finally, claims 8 and 13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oosthoek in view of Karagiannis, and further in view of Mohaban et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,647).

Applicants amend claim 1, as indicated herein, and submit that the applied art does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein said control comprises authorizing a transmission of at least one of the plurality of microflows at the elements,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants submit that independent claims 9 and 14 are patentable for similar reasons, as we did in the previously filed Response.

II. Claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 are patentable over Oosthoek and Karagiannis, in further view of Trans

Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, 10, and 11, which depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively, are patentable over the asserted combination of Oosthoek, Karagiannis, and Trans at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 9.

III. Claim 4 is patentable over Oosthoek in view of Bolding

Applicants submit that claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is patentable over the asserted combination of Oosthoek and Bolding at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

IV. Claims 8 and 13 are patentable over Oosthoek and Karagiannis, and further in view of Mohaban

Applicants submit that claims 8 and 13, which depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively, are patentable over the asserted combination of Oosthoek, Karagiannis, and Mohaban at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 21, 2010

/ Diallo T. Crenshaw 52,778 /
Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778